

**Minutes of the
Upper Mississippi River System
Environmental Management Program
Coordinating Committee**

**January 14, 1999
Special LTRMP Budget Meeting**

**St. Louis Airport Hilton
St. Louis, Missouri**

Dusty Rhodes of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. on Thursday, January 14, 1999. Other EMP-CC members present were Leslie Holland-Bartels (USGS), Marvin Hubbell (IL DNR), Kevin Szcodronski (IA DNR), Steve Johnson (MN DNR), Gordon Farabee (MO DOC), and Terry Moe (WI DNR). A complete list of attendees is attached.

Minutes of the November Meeting

Terry Moe moved and Marv Hubbell seconded approval of the minutes of the November 20, 1998 meeting. Moe requested that "HREP" replace "EMP" in the final sentence on p. 9 of the draft minutes. With this change, the sentence in question reads "Moe said Wisconsin would be unlikely to support nutrient reduction as a major HREP goal." The minutes were approved unanimously with Moe's requested change.

Opening Remarks

Dusty Rhodes recalled that several key factors with the potential to affect the LTRMP's budget situation were identified at the November 1998 EMP-CC meeting, but noted that there was uncertainty among Corps and USGS personnel regarding some of the specific budget numbers. As a result, EMP-CC members agreed in November to hold a special LTRMP budget meeting in January. While the EMP-CC did not endorse any specific strategies in November, members did agree with the general goal of minimizing personnel impacts in FY 99 to the extent possible.

Rhodes reported that, since the November meeting, Corps and USGS personnel have worked to reconcile differences in their budget numbers and to develop a FY 99 and out-year strategy for the LTRMP. According to Rhodes, the two agencies have been able to develop a largely *status quo* FY 99 program, primarily because the EMP will not have to repay FY 98 money that was reprogrammed from a Southeast Louisiana flood control project and because FY 95 and 96 LTRMP funds, which were reprogrammed to the HREP component in FY 98, will be returned to LTRMP.

Rhodes said budget realities make it impossible to pursue a *status quo* strategy for the LTRMP beyond FY 99. He described three basic principles that the Corps will pursue in managing the LTRMP and addressing the program's budget shortfall:

- 1) The LTRMP needs to concentrate more on data analysis relative to data collection.
- 2) The Corps will apply savings and slippage (S&S) to the LTRMP, consistent with the way S&S is assessed against other projects and programs in its construction general account.
- 3) The future LTRMP needs to be more flexible so that it can handle fluctuations in its annual funding level. The current program is dominated by personnel costs and cannot handle budget deviations without great disruption.

In response to a question from Terry Moe, Rhodes said it would take something quite compelling for the Corps to modify any of these three principles. He emphasized that the Corps must be very careful to be equitable in applying savings and slippage to its various projects and programs. Responding to questions from Kevin Szcodronski and Marv Hubbell, Rhodes emphasized that restructuring the LTRMP in accordance with these three principles is not equivalent to "ramping down" the program. He said the Corps strongly supports continuation of the both the HREP and LTRMP components, but feels equally strongly that the LTRMP should be modified.

Buddy Arnold characterized the goals for this special meeting as follows:

- Reach agreement among the EMP-CC members on the specific actions to meet the FY 99 shortfall.
- Reach agreement among the EMP-CC members on general out-year strategies given anticipated funding levels.

Corps/USGS Recommendation

Buddy Arnold and Bob Delaney highlighted several points regarding the joint Corps/USGS proposal, dated January 5, 1999, for addressing the LTRMP budget shortfall:

- 1) Funds are not adequate to maintain the LTRMP's *status quo* until the EMP is reauthorized and appropriations increase. Assuming the EMP is reauthorized in a Water Resources Development Act of 2000, the earliest appropriations would increase is FY 02, and that would require a Congressional add. The increased appropriations authorization could not be factored into the Administration's budget request until at least FY 03.
- 2) The Corps and USGS agree that, even if there were no funding shortfall, the LTRMP should be restructured. The restructuring should be based on the proposed data analysis and information needs assessment.
- 3) The proposal is not a ramp down of the LTRMP. But the Corps is committed to modifying the LTRMP consistent with the three principles outlined by Dusty Rhodes.

- 4) The proposal does not target field stations exclusively. Reductions in the LTRMP would come from the field stations, Science Center, and co-op agreements with universities.
- 5) There is a limit to how much the Science Center budget can be cut if the Center's data analysis capabilities are to be maintained.
- 6) The Corps will not pursue using Treasury Standard Form 1151 to transfer LTRMP funds to the USGS. The Corps' analysis indicates that it could not use the Treasury transfer mechanism without Congressional authorization. Moreover, using the form would exempt the LTRMP from savings and slippage, requiring the Corps to increase assessments against its other construction projects and violating its commitment to apply savings and slippage equally to all projects and programs in the account. Corps personnel also expressed concern that using the form would undermine the cohesiveness of the EMP, would limit the Corps' flexibility to transfer funding between EMP components, and would eliminate the contracting credit the Corps receives for LTRMP funds that go to the field stations.

Arnold presented an overhead showing projected LTRMP shortfalls assuming five percent annual cost increases, full authorized funding in FY 00-02, and no changes to the current program (Attachment 1). The projected shortfalls under these assumptions range from \$838,100 in FY 99 to \$1.6328 million in FY 02. (Arnold subsequently corrected these figures, saying the S&S figure had been inadvertently subjected to the inflation factor. The revised shortfall projections ranged from \$688,100 in FY 99 to \$1.4028 million FY 02.) Delaney then showed an overhead depicting how the Science Center's costs would be broken down among its sub-accounts under this scenario (Attachment 2). Responding to a question posed in the state EMP-CC members' December 1, 1998 letter, Delaney also provided information regarding current staffing levels at the Science Center and field stations (Attachment 3).

Arnold provided a breakout of the various Corps assessments against the LTRMP (Attachment 4). He announced that payments to the Waterways Experiment Station (WES) for John Barko's time are being reduced from \$45,000 per year to \$10,000 in FY 99. Arnold explained that the St. Paul District charges are for Dan Wilcox's time and the "management" category covers expenses for the Rock Island District's administration of the LTRMP as well as the LTRMP's share of Corps' payments to the UMRBA for EMP-CC support services. He also noted that HNA costs are assumed to terminate after FY 00 and that the actual savings and slippage rate in any given year could deviate from the seven percent estimate used for budget planning purposes.

Delaney observed that several factors are contributing to the projected LTRMP budget shortfalls in FY 99-02, including the following:

- the LTRMP's authorized funding levels are not cost-indexed;
- the LTRMP infrastructure was originally designed for a 10-year program and the program has been extended for an additional five years;
- the LTRMP experienced a \$1 million budget cut in FY 98, which was absorbed entirely at the Science Center; and
- the need to preserve the LTRMP's basic infrastructure until the EMP is reauthorized.

Delaney presented a graph showing the effects of inflation on the LTRMP's purchasing power. In response to a question from Chris Brescia, Dusty Rhodes said the declining constant dollar level of LTRMP funding is fairly similar to changes that have occurred Corps-wide over the same period.

FY 99 Strategy

Delaney and Arnold outlined the Corps/USGS strategy for addressing the FY 99 shortfall, estimated at \$838,100, without eliminating any core program personnel. This FY 99 strategy consists of the following actions:

- 1) Savings of \$100,000 by the Science Center and \$100,000 by the six field stations combined. These savings would be derived from a variety of measures, including salary savings from deferred staff replacements, reducing temporary staff, carryover from prior years, reducing printing and mailing costs, deferring computer upgrades, and reducing travel costs.
- 2) Allocating \$150,000 for outside expertise to assist with the data analysis and information needs assessment that will be used to inform decisions about restructuring the LTRMP in FY 00 and beyond.
- 3) Shifting costs for some LTRMP administrative, technical, and management costs to elsewhere within the Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center while assuming an equal amount of costs for science personnel at the Center. This exchange will be budget-neutral, but will increase the LTRMP's science capabilities.
- 4) The Corps will restore \$393,600 to the LTRMP. This includes restoration of the \$335,000 in FY 95 and 96 carryover that was transferred to the Corps in FY 98, restoration of \$11,600 in FY 99 savings and slippage, a \$35,000 reduction in the funding transferred to the Waterways Experiment Station, and a \$12,000 reduction in the Corps' costs for LTRMP coordination.
- 5) Prior year carryover of \$173,500 from the Iowa field station will be restored. Delaney noted that some other states have not yet indicated whether they have prior year carryover remaining.
- 6) The LTRMP's participation in a cost-shared USGS sediment study will be discontinued, saving \$118,000 in FY 99.

Out-year Strategy

Arnold and Delaney explained that the Corps and USGS propose the following out-year actions to address the LTRMP budget shortfall:

- 1) Reduce state overhead charges at the field stations by \$100,000 in FY 00 and by \$200,000 per year in FY 01 and 02.
- 2) Reduce monitoring costs by \$652,200 in FY 00, \$709,200 in FY 01, and \$1,036,600 in FY 02. These reductions would come from the field stations, Science Center, and university co-op agreements. Cost-saving measures could include reducing field infrastructure, modifying field data collection methods, and reducing systemic and centralized monitoring.

- 3) Reduce costs at the Science Center for managing the field stations by \$100,000 annually in FY 00-02.
- 4) Continue the field station and Science Center miscellaneous savings initiated in FY 99. These savings targets would be increased by 5 percent per year. Thus, the Science Center would be expected to achieve savings of \$105,000 in FY 00, \$110,300 in FY 01, and \$115,800 in FY 02. In combination, the six field stations would be expected to meet the same level of reductions.
- 5) Discontinuation of the cost-shared sediment study in FY 99 will also produce savings of \$123,900 in FY 00 and \$130,000 in FY 01.
- 6) Funding for the data analysis and information needs assessment efforts will be continued, with \$150,000 in FY 00, \$157,500 in FY 01, and \$165,400 in FY 02.

Data Analysis

Leslie Holland-Bartels emphasized that the value of data diminishes as the length of time between collection and analysis increases. She acknowledged that delays between collection and analysis have been a problem for the LTRMP in the past, but said USGS has been working hard, and successfully, to reduce the backlog of data awaiting analysis. She stressed that long-term decisions about the program need to be based on analysis of what has been collected, as well as input from the program partners. She said that data analysis is also critical to finding ways to deal with the near-term budget issues without undermining the integrity of the long-term program. According to Holland-Bartels, the data analysis effort proposed by USGS and the Corps will provide information about tradeoffs among various potential cost-savings measures, such as reductions in spatial scope, elimination of certain monitoring themes, and methodological changes. She stressed that the data analysis will not provide an answer about the optimal way to restructure. Rather, it will help people understand the risks associated with various alternatives. It will then be up to the program partners to determine what data they value most and what risks they are willing to accept.

Holland-Bartels explained that the proposed USGS-led data analysis effort will:

- identify redundancies in the program - this effort will use both quantitative and qualitative measures to look for redundancies among the six study reaches, within the monitoring components, and among different data collection techniques (e.g., among different fish sampling gears);
- explore associations among variables,
- look at the power and trend analysis capabilities within the current program - this will provide insight into the predictive capability of the data; and
- consider what variables are the most useful for assessing health of the system.

Holland-Bartels said the Science Center has most, if not all, of the expertise needed to conduct the data analysis, but said Center staff alone will not be able to complete the work in time to feed into the restructuring decisions. For this reason, the Corps/USGS proposal includes funding for outside assistance.

Information Needs Assessment

Tom Pullen distributed a one-page summary of the Information Needs Assessment (INA) proposed by the Corps and USGS. He explained that the INA will systematically and comprehensively identify specific information needed by river managers, thereby facilitating the allocation of limited resources to top information priorities. The INA will be conducted collaboratively, with the Corps managing the effort and the Corps and USGS serving as co-leads. Pullen explained that the assessment will examine needs for information at system-wide, river reach, and pool scales and will also consider temporal dimensions to information needs. The effort will identify information needed by management agencies as well as information needed to gage the system's ecological health. In response to a question from Steve Johnson, Pullen said the INA will build on the July 1998 EMTC Strategic Plan as well as the proposed data analysis, the cumulative impact assessment conducted for the Navigation Study, the ongoing Habitat Needs Assessment, and various LTRMP products that address information needs.

Johnson asked about the cost of the INA. Pullen explained that the Corps/USGS proposal includes \$150,000 in each of FY 99 and 00 for the data analysis and INA combined. This amount would increase to \$157,500 in FY 01 and \$165,400 in FY 02. Pullen said the precise allocation of this amount between the data analysis and INA has yet to be determined.

Terry Moe offered an alternative to the joint Corps/USGS proposal. He distributed copies of Wisconsin's alternative, explaining that using Treasury Standard Form 1151 and holding annual inflation to three percent substantially reduces the projected shortfalls.

Discussion

Tim Schlagenhaft offered the following preliminary perspectives from the A-Team, noting that he had consulted with most, but not all, A-Team members in developing his comments:

- Monitoring is the reason the LTRMP was initiated and it remains the A-Team's top priority.
- In considering cuts to the LTRMP, all aspects of the program should be on the table.
- A-Team members and field station staff should be consulted in the course of the data analysis and decision-making regarding restructuring.
- The A-Team worked with USGS for approximately two years to develop the Strategic Plan and identify objectives for the LTRMP. The INA should build upon this work, rather than starting from scratch.

Gordon Farabee said he is unwilling to discuss cutting permanent staff at the Cape Girardeau field station. Dusty Rhodes said the Corps wants to listen to the program partners and collaborate, but emphasized that ultimately the Corps and USGS must find a way for the LTRMP to live within its budget. Given that personnel costs dominate the program, Rhodes emphasized that this may well mean staff cuts at the field stations. Farabee said all other options should be considered first and that temporary staff should be cut before permanent staff. Marv Hubbell thanked the Corps and USGS for the work they have done to address the

FY 99 shortfall and offer a strategy for the out-years. Hubbell said the challenge is to address the projected budget shortfalls while preserving the LTRMP's integrity and capabilities to the maximum extent possible. He said this will be critical to ensuring that there is a sound program to build upon after reauthorization and increased appropriation levels are achieved.

Leslie Holland-Bartels observed that there are eight organizational units of the LTRMP that must participate in making the program work - i.e., the six field stations, the USGS, and the Corps. She emphasized that all eight units will have to participate in the reductions. Like the states, Holland-Bartels said USGS wants to maintain its core program staff, which includes both permanent and university co-op employees, to the maximum extent possible. Hubbell stressed that, in deciding how to address the shortfalls, the program partners should not have a pre-determined outcome. Instead, they should await the results of the data analysis and INA before deciding how to restructure the program.

Terry Moe suggested postponing the HNA and reprogramming both the LTRMP and the HREP HNA contributions back to the LTRMP. In addition to saving the LTRMP \$300,000 in contributions to the HNA, this would also make \$690,000 in HREP HNA funding available to address the LTRMP budget shortfall. Rhodes expressed surprise at this suggestion, noting that the states and others strongly supported initiation of the HNA. Rhodes said some of the HNA funds have already been spent and added that there might be "shutdown" costs associated with postponing the assessment. He also said that the Corps might not favor reprogramming the HREP component's portion of HNA costs to the LTRMP, noting that there are several underfunded HREPs. Kevin Szcodronski observed that even putting the full \$1.0 million budgeted for the HNA into the LTRMP would not eliminate the LTRMP's budget problems. Rhodes said the Corps would consider Moe's suggestion, but reminded EMP-CC members that the Corps is committed to restructuring the LTRMP so that it can tolerate some fluctuation in its annual budget and so that it places more emphasis on analysis relative to data collection. Rhodes expressed concern that Moe's suggestion amounts to a recommendation to maintain the *status quo*. Moe rejected this characterization, saying that he is simply advocating avoiding irreversible changes while the program partners make the right decision regarding how to restructure the LTRMP. Moe said the restructuring process should not start out with the conclusion that the LTRMP needs to cut monitoring and increase data analysis, stressing that such conclusions should be drawn only after the data analysis and INA are completed.

Szcodronski warned of a possible danger in cutting monitoring and increasing analytical capabilities at the same time, noting that, if data collection is curtailed, the need for analysis will also be reduced. Szcodronski also observed that a credible trend data program is difficult to reconcile with annual flexibility. He said problem analysis and research efforts are easier to modify as money fluctuates. Rhodes said he recognizes the inherent inflexibility in trend monitoring and said this is one of the reasons the Corps believes monitoring should be reduced as a percentage of the overall program. Szcodronski said the LTRMP is just getting to the point where people can use its trend data effectively and cautioned that any breaks in the data will undermine its usefulness substantially. Szcodronski said he does not favor substituting cause/effect studies for trend data collection. Steve Cobb said that this is not what the Corps wants either. Cobb stressed that the Corps is seeking to analyze the existing trend data to determine how to make future data collection more effective and efficient in meeting managers' needs.

Szcodronski noted that the Iowa legislature is already developing the state's FY 00 budget and asked for clarification regarding the timing of the INA and data analysis relative to when decisions must be made about federal FY 00. Rhodes said the immediate next step is for MVD to issue the Rock Island District a directive. He said this letter will not be highly specific, but it will convey the Corps' three general principles and direct the district to work with the program partners on a restructuring plan that embodies these principles. Delaney suggested developing scopes of work (SOWs) for the data analysis and INA prior to the February EMP-CC meeting. He said it will be important to implement the SOWs aggressively if the analysis and INA are to provide information for restructuring decisions to be implemented in FY 00. Delaney said it is also important to begin exploring other potential sources of funding, such as EPA funding that might be available for water quality monitoring.

Pete Redmon said EPA supports the three general principles offered by the Corps. Redmon also noted that EPA already funds state water quality monitoring on the Upper Mississippi River through Section 106 of the Clean Water Act, though the states largely choose to spend their §106 money on other priorities. Redmon suggested that the states could pursue interstate §106 money, similar to what the Ohio River states do through the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission (ORSANCO).

Szcodronski observed that there are three elements of the Corps/USGS proposal that are specifically linked to the field stations - i.e., field station savings, reduced state overhead, and restructuring out-year monitoring. Delaney explained that the field station savings category consists of operations belt tightening measures. Delaney said USGS would give each field station a target reduction in this category, but that it would be up to the individual field stations to determine how to meet the target. Szcodronski and Steve Johnson explained that their agencies' ability to reduce state overhead charges may be quite limited. For example, the overhead charged by the Lake City field station is the result of an indirect cost rate negotiated between the Minnesota Department of Administration and the U.S. Department of the Interior and is applied to all Minnesota agreements with DOI agencies. Johnson said this money is transferred to the Department of Administration and is not something that the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources can alter. Delaney observed that, if a state is unable to reduce its overhead, that will mean there is more money that must be cut from another category, such as monitoring.

Johnson acknowledged the need to restructure the LTRMP and to consider staff cuts, but he emphasized that all options should be on the table and said the materials provided by USGS and the Corps appear to presuppose that a disproportionate share of the cuts will fall on the field stations. Johnson said postponing the HNA and the INA should both be considered. He also said that consideration of staff reductions must extend to the Science Center as well as the field stations. Holland-Bartels said USGS has not endorsed any particular allocation of the monitoring savings targets among the field stations, Science Center, and university co-ops. Johnson said he is willing to deal with the budget reductions on a proportional basis, but said he would not support any field station closures unless the science clearly justifies such an action.

Rhodes expressed concern with Johnson's suggestion to delay the INA, noting that the INA is intended to help inform decisions about restructuring. Johnson said it appears that restructuring decisions will need to be made before the INA is completed. Terry Moe urged

the Corps to reconsider its rejection of the Treasury transfer form. He said the impact on the Corps' contracting targets would not be that great and suggested that spreading the LTRMP's savings and slippage out over all other construction projects would not have a substantial effect on those projects. Rhodes said the Corps has fully considered the Treasury transfer option and has rejected it. He said other project sponsors also raise the S&S question and he emphasized that it is critical for the Corps to apply S&S equitably to all projects. Szcodronski said savings and slippage could be applied to the LTRMP and then every effort could be made to recover that money each year. He said these funds could be used for equipment purchases and other non-personnel costs. Rhodes said competition for reprogrammed funds is extremely tight. He also emphasized that the Corps would reject any LTRMP work plan that relies on recovering S&S, repeating that the Corps and USGS must design a program consistent with a budget that includes S&S. Holland-Bartels concurred, saying that she will not manage a program comprised of 70-80 percent personnel costs that is based on recovering S&S. In response to a question from Ken Lubinski, Rhodes offered to provide the program partners with a written explanation of savings and slippage.

Referring to Rhodes and Holland-Bartels' January 5 letter, Moe asked whether the EMP-CC has the USGS's assurance that the LTRMP will get the full amount of time it is due from Center scientists in exchange for the administrative staff time the LTRMP is contributing to the Center. Holland-Bartels assured Moe that the LTRMP would receive all of the time it is due from the scientists in question.

Gordon Farabee expressed interest in Moe's earlier suggestion to postpone the HNA, asking by how long such an action would delay the need for major restructuring. Rhodes reminded Farabee that some of the HNA funds have been spent and that there could be additional costs associated with shutting down the assessment. Holly Stoerker expressed concern that postponing the HNA would provide only temporary benefits to the LTRMP while exposing the entire EMP to criticism from outside groups and members of Congress who have strongly advocated the HNA. Rhodes noted that Corps Headquarters is also very interested in the HNA and might well question a decision to postpone it.

Moe urged the Corps and USGS to review their assumptions about inflation increases, noting that Wisconsin found using a three percent rate substantially reduced projected shortfalls. Rhodes agreed to review the inflation assumptions. Moe also said the non-monitoring components of the LTRMP should be reviewed for potential cost savings. Holland-Bartels said all aspects of the program are on the table. Moe also asked whether it would be possible to achieve savings by consolidating the districts' HREP planning and design capabilities into one or two districts and allocating those HREP savings to the LTRMP. Rhodes said the Corps is in fact exploring the opportunities to regionalize some of the expertise currently maintained in each of the districts, but he said the implications of such efforts for the EMP are by no means clear. Rhodes added that he would tend to assume that any savings on the HREP side should be put toward meeting the needs of underfunded habitat projects. He noted that political support for the program is closely linked to progress with projects on the ground.

Johnson questioned the decision to invest in computer upgrades while staff cuts are on the table, suggesting computer purchases be deferred until staffing decisions are made. Delaney noted that the proposed equipment purchases have already been delayed for two years. Johnson said they should be further delayed until the restructured program takes shape.

Johnson said holding the equipment budget to five percent annual increases and allocating the cuts proportionately among the field stations, university co-ops, and Science Center would require each to reduce costs by approximately 17 percent. Holland-Bartels said program partners would need to consider the programmatic impacts of proportional cuts, noting the strictly proportional cuts might not make the most sense.

Szcodronski said Iowa does not currently support postponing the HNA or HREPs as a means of addressing the LTRMP budget shortfall. He said he would need to see the results of the data analysis before considering such suggestions.

Next Steps

There was considerable discussion among the EMP-CC members regarding how best to proceed. Dusty Rhodes emphasized that USGS and the Corps will need to explore many of the issues raised during the preceding discussion and report back to the committee. Several EMP-CC members emphasized that decisions regarding how to meet the budget shortfall should not be made before the results of the data analysis and information needs assessment are available. However, it was also recognized that decisions regarding FY 00 need to be made by early summer in order to provide the minimum reasonable time to implement any staff reductions. The INA and data analysis will not be completed by this time. However, Holland-Bartels said USGS could prepare a first-cut data analysis in advance of the May meeting. She said USGS will try to focus on priority questions for this first-cut. She reminded the committee that the data analysis will not provide "the answer" about program restructuring but instead will provide insights as to the likely impacts of various alternatives. Kevin Szcodronski asked that members of the A-Team be consulted as the Corps and USGS work on the data analysis and INA. In response to a question from Tim Schlagenhaft, Szcodronski clarified that he is not asking the A-Team to develop recommendations regarding restructuring. Instead, he explained, he is simply asking the USGS and the Corps to involve the A-Team members as they conduct the technical data analysis.

Szcodronski asked who will be responsible for developing a recommended restructuring plan based on the first-cut analysis, noting that the EMP-CC will not be able to synthesize the analysis and develop such a plan at its May meeting. Rhodes said the Rock Island District will use the first-cut analysis to prepare a recommendation for consideration by the EMP-CC in May. Holly Stoerker requested that Rock Island provide more than one option. Rhodes said he would only commit to having the district prepare a single recommended strategy. Gordon Farabee said it will be important to distribute the district's proposal to the EMP-CC members in advance of the May meeting to allow adequate time for in-house review prior to the meeting. Rhodes agreed to distribute a written summary of the recommended alternative and its anticipated impacts two weeks before the meeting.

In response to a request from Marv Hubbell, Rhodes agreed that the February EMP-CC meeting should include further discussion about the LTRMP budget situation and an update regarding progress on the data analysis and INA. He also committed to keeping A-Team members involved in the data analysis effort and said A-Team members should take responsibility for coordinating with their EMP-CC counterparts regarding the analysis.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.